

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending. Claims 1 19, 31, and 37-43 have been amended.

I. Objections to the Claims:

Claim 1 is objected to because of an informality. The informality has been corrected herein. The other independent claims have been similarly amended.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101:

Claims 37-42 are rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

III. Rejections Over the Prior Art:

In responding to the Examiner's prior art rejections, Applicant here only justifies the patentability of the independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 19, 31, 37 and 43). As the Examiner will appreciate, should these independent claims be patentable over the prior art, narrower dependent claims would also necessarily be patentable. Accordingly, Applicant does not separately discuss the patentability of the dependent claims, although it reserves the right to do so at a later time if necessary.

All independent claims stand rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Special Edition, Using AutoCAD 2000 ("SE"). Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection.

Claim 1 can be used to show the error in the Examiner's analysis. Claim 1 recites:

A method using a display coupled to a computer for navigating the contents of a file accessible by the computer, comprising:

- displaying a first portion of the contents on a region of the display at a first magnification;
- selecting a first option to display a second portion of the contents of the file on the display within the region at a second magnification, wherein the second magnification is lower than the first magnification;
- defining an area within the displayed second portion by highlighting the first portion;
- moving the area to a new location on the displayed second portion to encompass a third portion; and
- displaying the third portion on the display within the region at a third magnification, wherein the third magnification is higher than the second magnification.

The Examiner considers the Zoom Dynamic feature on page 3, paragraphs 3-5 and in Figure 11.3 of SE to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. However, the Zoom Dynamic option is simply used to “magnify a general area of the drawing that you want to work in” (SE, page 3, paragraph 3). SE does not disclose “displaying a first portion of the contents on a region of the display at a first magnification,” and “selecting a first option to display a second portion of the contents of the file on the display within the region at a second magnification, wherein the second magnification is lower than the first magnification,” as recited in claim 1.

Zoom Dynamic merely shows the current magnification window and a panning view box (i.e., the area to be magnified) in relation to the extents (i.e., the boundaries) of a drawing. Each of these areas has the same magnification. In other words, SE merely discloses multiple areas of equal magnification, each area having a different size, on a display. Therefore, SE does not disclose a first portion at a first magnification and a second portion at a second magnification, where the second magnification is lower than the first magnification. The Examiner's attempt to

equate the elements of SE to the recited claim limitations is clearly not commensurate with the language of claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that in SE, the current magnification factor is shown in relationship to the overall drawing. However, even if one assumes that the green line showing the current magnification factor is equivalent to the claimed first portion and the blue line showing the extents of the drawing is equivalent to the claimed second portion, it is clear from the above discussion that these two portions are at the same magnification. Further, SE cannot show or suggest “defining an area within the second portion by highlighting the first portion,” and “moving the area to a new location on the displayed second portion to encompass a third portion,” as the panning view box encompasses only a portion of the area representing the current magnification factor. Alternatively, if one assumes that the panning view box is the claimed first portion, it becomes apparent that SE cannot show or suggest a second portion at a second magnification, as SE shows three distinct areas of different size, each area having the same magnification.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 (and the corresponding dependent claims) on the basis of SE cannot stand. Furthermore, while the remaining independent claims 19, 31, 37, and 43 use slightly different language, the above argument with respect to claim 1 is similarly applicable to the language of these claims. Thus, claims 19, 31, 37, and 43 (and their dependent claims) are also not rejectable on the basis of SE.

* * * * *

Based on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-43 are allowable, and requests that a Notice of Allowance issue for these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathaniel Pettigrew/
Nathaniel Pettigrew, Reg. No. 59,007

April 26, 2007

Date

CUSTOMER NO. 29855

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P..
20333 SH 249. Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070
832/446-2400
832/446-2424 (facsimile)
wcpatent@counselip.com